

R marks

Claims 1-3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (JP 4-278922) in view of Umemoto et al. (US 6,199,995) and further in view of Fukui et al. (US 5,980,054).

1. Rejection of claims 1-3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (JP 4-278922) in view of Umemoto et al. (US 6,199,995) and further in view of Fukui et al. (US 5,980,054) for reasons of record, as recited on pages 2-5 of the above-indicated Office action (part of paper no.10).

Response:

The Examiner states that "The final limitation of claim 1, that the circumference is equal to or greater than the length of the back-light plate, is a necessary condition for using such a roller to form the back-light plate of Suzuki, with its recesses increasing in size uniformly from one end to the other. This limitation is therefore inherently met, so claim 1 is unpatentable."

The applicant respectfully disagrees that it is a necessary condition for Suzuki to use a roller with a circumference equal to or greater than the length of the back-light plate. Please refer to Fig.2 of Suzuki. In none of the example diagrams shown in Fig.2 do the recesses 6 increase in size uniformly from top to bottom in the back-light plate 2. In fact, the recesses 6 in the back-light plate 2 could easily be made using a press having

5 a circumference roughly half the length of the back-light plate 2, and rolling the press in the direction from top to bottom. Therefore, in the Suzuki patent there is neither a necessary nor inherently met condition for the circumference to be equal to or greater than the length of the back-light plate.

10 As the examiner states in page 4 of the Office action, the "device of Suzuki in view of Umemoto does not disclose using a roller to form the recesses". Furthermore, while Fukui et al. (US 5,980,054) mentions the word "roller" in passing, Fukui does not teach or suggest that the circumference of the roller should be equal to or greater than the length of the back-light plate. There is no
15 motivation given by Suzuki, Umemoto, or Fukui to suggest using a roller having a circumference equal to or greater than the length of the back-light plate to form recesses on the back-light plate.

20 Therefore, the present invention according to the previously amended claim 1 is not obvious over the combination of Suzuki, Umemoto, and Fukui. Reconsideration of claim 1 is hereby requested. Claims 2-3 and 5 are both dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is
25 allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2-3 and 5 is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

30



Date: 10/16/2003

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No.41,526

、 CUST#A89017
NPO#API-P0084-USA:0/初稿/馬思賢

P.O. BOX 506

Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw